



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST	NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/353	,942 12/	12/94 SEGAT	TA	T 91221A

13M1/1122

BRUCE J. HENDRICKS
DEPARTMENT 823
THE GOODYEAR TIRE & RUBBER COMPANY
1144 EAST MARKET STREET
AKRON OH 44316-0001

	AMINER
HOT.	NSTONE, A
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
130	1 AS
DATE MAILED:	11 (2) 197

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

- ADVISORY ACTION						
才	ТН	E PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:				
a)		is extended to run or continues to run 3 months from the date of the final rejection				
b)		expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.				
		Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.				
		pellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).				
Ø	App to p	blicant's response to the final rejection, filed $\frac{11/13/96}{}$ has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed blace the application in condition for allowance:				
1.		The proposed amendments to the claim and /or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:				
		 a. — There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented. 				
		b. They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).				
		c. They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).				
		d. They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.				
		e. They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.				
		NOTE:				
2.		Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.				
3.	Ø	Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment 💢 will be entered 🗌 will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:				
		Claims allowed:				
		Claims objected to:				
		However;				
		M Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph in para. 3 of the Office action majed 8/15/96.				
4.	X	The affidevit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because				
5. (The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficent reasons why it was not earlier presented.				
	The	proposed drawing correction has has not been approved by the examiner. ADRIENNE C. JOHNSTONE				
	Othe	PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1300				
		(REV. 5-89) Advance C. Johnston				
PTOL	303	(REV. 5-89)				

Serial Number 08/353,942

Art Unit 1301

Attachment to Advisory Action, Paper Number 25

1. Since it is clear applicants intended to adopt the examiner's suggested amendments

including the amendment to claim 1 line 7 changing "2" to -- about 12 -- , the examiner

has so amended claim 1 line 7 as per MPEP 714.23.

2. The examiner awaits a corrected declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.132 by inventor Paul

Harry Sandstrom adding the identification of the subject matter intended to be attributed

to him. It appears to the examiner that such a declaration would overcome the prior art

rejections of record for all pending claims (1-2, 4-6, 8-14).

3. Applicants' arguments have been fully addressed in the previous Office actions.

4. Applicants are reminded of this application's qualification for transitional after final

practice as set forth in para. 13 of the Office action mailed August 15, 1996.

Adrienne Johnstone

November 21, 1996

ADRIENNE C. JOHNSTONE PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1300

Whome C. Johnston